



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,848	04/05/2004	Yoshiyuki Asayama	251407US0DIV	2704
22850	7590	03/17/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			VARCOT, MATHIEU D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1791		
		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		03/17/2008		ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/816,848	Applicant(s) ASAYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner Mathieu D. Vargot	Art Unit 1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 17,19,20,23 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 17,19,20,23 and 25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/5/04</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1791

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17, 19, 20, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsura et al in view of Norlander et al (PCT Publication WO 00/14333) and the instant specification starting at page 18, lines 4-16 essentially for reasons of record noting the following.

Katsura et al and Norlander et al are being applied for reasons of record, the references at best failing to show the instant height of the vessel and that the molding base paper is prepared using the instant multi-layer combination former. Concerning the former, the primary reference does disclose a height of 2 cm, and hence the ratio set forth in instant equation 5 would be .162, which admittedly is less than the instant amended value of .2. However, it should be noted that this constitutes the only example of forming where dimensions are given in Katsura et al. Since the paper in Katsura et al has the instant elongation at break, and the primary reference makes it clear that such is required for molding –see column 4, lines 1-5—one of ordinary skill in the art would find it reasonable that such would allow deeper containers to be molded—ie, containers with a height allowing them to fulfill instant equation 5. Indeed, to meet the ratio of instant equation 5, for values between .2 and 1.2, the height of the molded vessel in Katsura et al would have to be between 2.46 cm and 14.78 cm. There is simply no reason not to believe that the process of Katsura et al would not have been

able to mold a container with a height of around 2.5 cm or more and hence this aspect – ie, meeting instant equation 5 exactly—is submitted to have been within the skill level of the art of Katsura et al. Concerning the formation of the base paper, it is noted that applicant admits that the instant combination former is known in the art to form ordinary paperboards. It certainly would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use such a former to make the paperboard resulting from the combination of Katsura et al and Norlander et al. The primary reference teaches making the paperboard of various pulps and such would of course be expected when forming a paperboard.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of the amendment, the instant specification has been used to show that the instant method of forming a multilayered paperboard is known—applicant virtually admits as much in the response, anyway. Other than that, the rejection remains the same. The instant paperboard properties are submitted to be met or rendered obvious over the combination of Katsura et al and Norlander et al, for reasons generally given. There is nothing of record that shows the paperboard of Norlander et al would not have the ability to be drawn and molded or formed in the instant manner and that taught by Katsura et al. The 1449 form noted as having not been initialed for document FA has been initialed for all references contained therein and accompanies this action.

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
February 28, 2008

/Mathieu D. Vargot/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791